

**WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES**

**EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION
FOR REPEAT DRUNKEN DRIVING**

PHASE 2, PART 3: QUANTITATIVE TELEPHONE SURVEY

SEPTEMBER 21, 2001

PREPARED BY:

THE DIERINGER RESEARCH GROUP, INC.



Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	1-5
Study Background.....	2
Study Research Objectives.....	2
Summary and Conclusions.....	6-9
Background	7
Findings.....	7
Similarities Among the Four Types of Respondents.....	7
Treatment	7
Supervision.....	8
Jail.....	8
Differences Between the Four Types of Respondents.....	9
Law Enforcement Respondents.....	9
Corrections and Probation and Parole Respondents	9
Court System Respondents.....	9
Treatment/Education Respondents.....	9
Main Findings	10-26
Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving.....	11
Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 1	12
Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 2	13
Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 3	14
Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 4	15
Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 5	16
Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving:	
By Respondent Type.....	17-18
Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving.....	19
Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 1	20
Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 2	21
Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 3	22
Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving:	
By Respondent Type.....	23-24
The Main Goal of Dealing with Drunk Drivers: By Respondent Type	25
The Main Goal of Dealing with Drunk Drivers: By Demographic Group	26
Appendix – Survey Questionnaire	27-33

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Study Background

This research project is being conducted as a result of the 1999 Wisconsin Act 109, Section 88 (1) that requires that:

“The Departments of Corrections, Health and Family Services and Transportation shall jointly study and evaluate the desirability of using treatment programs and other alternatives to incarceration as a way to reduce the length of incarceration or the need for incarceration of a person convicted of a second or subsequent violation of operating a motor vehicle while under the influence on an intoxicant, controlled substance or other drug.”

At the request of the above mentioned departments, The Dieringer Research Group (The DRG), acting as an independent research consultant, has been contracted to conduct the research study. Russell G. Brooker, Ph.D. is the study’s principal researcher and author. Laura M. Cleary is the Project Manager. Richard W. Yob is the Account Manager. The DRG recommended the Study of Evaluation of Alternatives to Incarceration for Impaired Driving to be conducted in three phases, as outlined below.

Phase One: Secondary Data Collection/Case History Development

Phase Two: Primary Data Collection

Step One: Milwaukee and Madison, Wisconsin

Step Two: Green Bay, Superior, Wausau, Eau Claire, and La Crosse, Wisconsin

Step Three: Statewide Quantitative Survey of Wisconsin

Phase Three: Analysis/Interpretation of Study Findings

This document presents the findings of Phase Two, Step Three, the quantitative survey.

Study Research Objectives

Phase One:

- Review available research literature, public policy and program issues of practices of alternatives to incarceration for repeat impaired driving offenders nationwide.
- Identify examples of best practices including detailed case study profiles.

Phase Two:

- Identify the practices currently being utilized in Wisconsin as alternatives to incarceration for repeat impaired driving offenders in these categories:
 - Identify the practices currently being used in Wisconsin to reduce repeat drunk driving.
 - Assess the effectiveness of various measures in reducing repeat drunk driving.
 - Learn about the characteristics of drunk drivers in Wisconsin.
 - Obtain insight and advice about reducing drunk driving.

Phase Three:

- Assess and evaluate the effectiveness of the various practices.

Introduction

For this Step Three of Phase Two, The Dieringer Research Group, Inc. conducted 250 quantitative telephone interviews with people knowledgeable about repeat drunk driving (240 interviews are analyzed in the main part of this report). All respondents worked in Wisconsin. Interviews were conducted during August, 2001.

The questions for this survey were developed using the results of previous phases of this project—the literature review, the four focus groups, and the 15 in-depth telephone interviews. The most important measures designed to reduce repeat drunk driving were included in the questionnaire for this study.

Respondents were selected to represent a variety of different kinds of people with different perspectives. The respondents were also selected so that they complemented the four focus groups and 15 in-depth interviews that had been conducted earlier. In the focus group discussions, all of the participants had lived in the Milwaukee or Madison areas. Respondents in the 15 in-depth interviews had lived in other areas of the state. The respondents in this phase of the study were selected to represent all areas of the state in as many counties as possible. Respondents from virtually all Wisconsin counties were interviewed for this part of the study.

The study respondents were classified into ten functional areas. These functional areas were grouped into four categories. The four categories of respondents are:

- Law enforcement
- Corrections and Probation and Parole
- Court system (prosecution, defense, court employees)
- Treatment, education, government, public health, and social services

The sampling design of this study involved obtaining a sample of each of the four types of respondents. We obtained enough interviews (at least 50) for each of the four categories of respondents so that analysis would be meaningful for each one.

This design is different from one that would attempt to obtain a random sample of all the people who deal with repeat drunk driving, with the number of interviews of each type of professional being proportionate to their number of all professionals in the state who deal with repeat drunk driving. For example, with this alternative sampling design, if law enforcement personnel made up 60% of the professionals in Wisconsin who deal with repeat drunk driving, they would make up 60% of the sample.

We chose the design of four separate categories for two reasons:

1. We do not know what percent of people who deal with repeat drunk driving are in each employment category—principally because it is impossible to precisely define how much contact with repeat drunk drivers would qualify a person for inclusion in this study. For example, every police officer who patrols the state's streets and highways deals with repeat drunk driving. Should we count all of them?

Introduction

2. If we did use a sample in which the various professionals were interviewed according to their proportion in the entire set of people who deal with repeat drunk driving, we would probably end up with greatly varying sample sizes that would render statistical comparison meaningless. For example, we would conceivably end up with 150 interviews of police officers and 15 interviews of professionals in education and treatment. While we would learn a great deal about the opinions of police officers, we would not learn anything about the opinions of people in education and treatment—and would not be able to compare the two groups.

With the four categories, we did obtain enough interviews with people in the four groups for meaningful analysis and useful comparisons.

Because of the sampling design, this study should be viewed as four separate surveys that were conducted simultaneously and used the same questionnaire. The “Total” results for all four categories of respondents will be used in this report to organize the presentation of the findings, but the “Total” data will not be shown.

The functional areas and job categories of the respondents are shown on the following table:

Functional Areas of Survey Respondents	
Job Type / Functional Area	Number in Survey
Law Enforcement	50
Corrections and Probation and Parole	60
Corrections*	25
Probation and Parole	35
Court System	61
Legislative/Court System – Defense	20
Legislative/Court System – Prosecution	22
Legislative/Court System – Judicial	19
Government, Public Health, Treatment, Education, Social Services	69
Government/Public Health/Social Services	35
Treatment/Counseling/Education	34
*24 of the 25 Corrections respondents are employees of county jails	

Introduction

In addition to their occupations, respondents were classified according to the type of their county (urban, middle, rural), gender, and years of experience in the current functional area. (Because of the sampling design that attempted to gather data from all areas of the state, the rural counties are over-represented in this study.) The number of respondents in each of these demographic characteristics is:

Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents	
Demographic Characteristic	Number in Survey
Type of County	
Urban (200,000+ population: Milwaukee, Dane, Waukesha, Brown)	41
Middle (100,000 – 200,000 population: Racine, Outagamie, Rock, Winnebago, Kenosha, Marathon, Washington, Sheboygan, La Crosse)	57
Rural (All other counties)	155
Gender	
Male	169
Female	81
Years of Experience in Functional Area	
10 or less	88
11 – 20	82
21 or more	80
Note: Because the data in this table are not limited to the four employment categories, answers of all 250 survey respondents are shown. The number of respondents in the three types of counties is greater than 250 because some respondents worked in multiple counties.	

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS



Summary and Conclusions

Background

The 1999 Wisconsin Act 109, Section 88 (1) requires the Wisconsin Departments of Corrections, Health and Family Services, and Transportation to jointly study and evaluate the desirability of using treatment programs and other alternatives to incarceration as a way to reduce the length of incarceration or need for incarceration of persons convicted of a second or subsequent violation of operating a motor vehicle while under the influence of an intoxicant, controlled substance or other drug. The study is being conducted in three phases.

In this phase, The Dieringer Research Group, Inc. conducted 250 quantitative telephone interviews with experts on drunk driving. Ten of the respondents did not classify themselves into one of the four job categories and are not included in the main analyses of this report. Therefore, for most of this report, the answers of 240 respondents are analyzed. All respondents worked in Wisconsin. All interviews were conducted during August, 2001.

Respondents were selected to represent a variety of different kinds of people with different perspectives. The respondents were also selected so that they represented all areas of the state, in as many counties as possible

Findings

Respondents were divided into four categories based on their occupations and were analyzed individually. The four categories are:

- Law Enforcement
- Corrections and Probation and Parole
- Court System (prosecution, defense, and court employees)
- Treatment, Education, Government, Public Health, and Social Services

Respondents were asked to evaluate various measures and ideas about the best ways to reduce repeat drunk driving in two ways. First, they were asked to rate the effectiveness of 26 measures, using a “1 to 5” scale. Second, they were asked to agree or disagree with 21 statements about repeat drunk driving.

Similarities Among the Four Types of Respondents

Using both types of questions, the main lessons of the survey point to the importance of three measures:

- Treatment
- Supervision
- Jail

Treatment

Over 80% of each of the four categories of respondents agreed that “The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to rehabilitate the drivers so they do not drive drunk again.” In fact, of three possible “main goals” that were included in the questionnaire (rehabilitation, getting the drunk drivers off the roads, and punishment), more respondents in each of the four categories agreed with rehabilitation than with either of the other two goals.

Summary and Conclusions

All four types of respondents rated the effectiveness of drug and alcohol treatment as first or second of the 26 measures included in the questionnaire: Court System and Treatment/Education respondents gave it the highest ratings, while Law Enforcement and Corrections/Probation and Parole respondents gave the second highest ratings.

In addition, about half of each type of respondent gave high effectiveness ratings to education on alcoholism and alcohol abuse.

At least 80% of each of the four categories of respondents agreed with the following two statements:

- “Repeat drunk drivers will probably keep driving drunk unless they have some treatment.”
- “All offenders with two or more drunk driving arrests should be required to go through treatment.”

One possible component of treatment is attendance at a Victim Impact Panel. At least 78% of each of the four types of respondents agreed with the statement:

- “All repeat drunk drivers should be required to attend a Victim Impact Panel if one is available.”

Supervision

All four types of respondents rated the effectiveness of “intensive supervision begun as soon as possible after the arrest” as first or second of the 26 measures included in the questionnaire: Law Enforcement and Corrections/Probation and Parole respondents gave the highest ratings, while Court System and Treatment/Education respondents gave it the second highest ratings.

In addition, about half of each type of respondent gave high effectiveness ratings to probation after conviction.

Jail

Neither short-term nor long-term jail sentences were rated highly by many respondents as effective measures to reduce repeat drunk driving. However, the importance of jail as part of the mix in fighting drunk driving was shown by the agreement levels of the respondents to two statements about jail. At least 78% of each of the four types of respondents agreed with the following two statements:

- “Jail time should always be an option for sentencing repeat drunk drivers.”
- “All second-time offenders should be subject to at least one day of jail.”

Summary and Conclusions

Differences Between the Four Types of Respondents

Although all four types of respondents were similar in demonstrating confidence in measures related to treatment, supervision, and jail, there were some differences between the respondents. Following are the four types of respondents and some other measures they rated highly or statements with which they were particularly likely to agree¹.

Law Enforcement Respondents

Law Enforcement respondents were especially likely to agree with the following statements:

- “The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to get them off the roads.”
- “Wisconsin needs to get tougher on repeat drunk driving.”

Corrections and Probation and Parole Respondents

Correction and Probation and Parole respondents gave high effectiveness ratings to:

- Ignition Interlock Device
- Long-term jail or prison sentence
- Immobilizing or disabling the drunk driver’s vehicle

They were likely to agree with the following statement:

- “The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to get them off the roads.”

Court System Respondents

Court System respondents were especially likely to agree with the following statement:

- “Judges should have more discretion in sentencing drunk drivers.”

Treatment/Education Respondents

Treatment/Education respondents gave high effectiveness ratings to:

- Victim Impact Panels
- Ignition Interlock Device

They were likely to agree with the following statement:

- “Society, as a whole, is not aware enough of the penalties and punishments for repeat drunk driving.”

¹ For ease of reading, an arbitrary cutoff of 55% rating a measure as effective or 75% agreement with a statement is used in this section of the Executive Summary. See the main body of the report for more detail.

MAIN FINDINGS

Main Findings

Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving

All survey respondents were asked to evaluate the effectiveness of 26 measures that have been used or suggested to reduce repeat drunk driving. They evaluated each measure on a “1 to 5” scale in which “5” meant “very effective” and “1” meant “not at all effective.”

In order to eliminate any bias due to the order of the measures, the specific measures appeared during the interviews in random order—that is, the order was different for each respondent.

The following tables show the percentage of respondents for each of the four groupings of respondents who rated each measure as “5,” the highest rating, or “4,” the second highest rating. In this analysis, the 26 measures will be broken into five categories:

- Level 1: The four measures that received the highest percentages of “4” or “5” ratings from the respondents
- Level 2: The seven measures that received the second highest percentages of “4” or “5” ratings from the respondents
- Level 3: The eight measures that received the third highest percentages of “4” or “5” ratings from the respondents
- Level 4: The five measures that received the fourth highest percentages of “4” or “5” ratings from the respondents
- Level 5: The two measures that received the fewest “4” or “5” ratings from the respondents

In the tables, some percents are **bolded** to indicate that they are statistically significantly higher (at the 95% level of confidence) than one or more other percents.

Main Findings

Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 1

The measures that received the most high effectiveness ratings dealt with drug and alcohol treatment, intensive supervision, probation, and education on alcoholism or alcohol abuse.

Over half of each type of respondent rated two measures as effective, with over three-fourths of the respondents from Court Systems and Treatment/Education giving high ratings. The two measures are:

- Treatment, such as drug or alcohol treatment
- Intensive supervision begun as soon as possible after the arrest

Over three-fourths (77%) of both Court System and Treatment/Education respondents gave high ratings to drug and alcohol treatment. Over 60% of each of the four types of respondents gave high ratings to intensive supervision begun as soon as possible after the drunk driver's arrest.

Approximately half of each group gave high ratings to probation after conviction and education on alcoholism or alcohol abuse.

Effectiveness of Measures: Level 1 Received the Highest Percentages of “4” and “5” Ratings Percent “4” or “5” on a “1 to 5” Scale in Which “5” Means “Very Effective”				
Measure	Type of Respondent			
	Law	Corr/Pro	Courts	Treat/Ed
<i>Sample Size =</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>69</i>
Treatment, such as drug or alcohol treatment	54%	58%	77%	77%
Intensive supervision begun as soon as possible after the arrest	62%	63%	66%	75%
Probation after conviction	48%	45%	61%	52%
Education on alcoholism or alcohol abuse	46%	47%	51%	52%
Source: Data Table 57				

Main Findings

Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 2

Significantly more (58%) Corrections/Probation and Parole and Treatment/Education respondents gave high ratings to Ignition Interlock Devices. Fewer respondents from Law Enforcement (44%) gave high ratings to this measure, and only 30% of Court System respondents did so.

More than six of ten (62%) of Treatment/Education respondents gave high ratings to Victim Impact Panels, but less than half of the other three groups did so.

More than half (57%) of Correction/Probation and Parole respondents gave high ratings to long-term jail or prison sentences, but less than half of the other respondents did so.

On this table and the following two tables, Court System respondents tended to give fewer high ratings than the other three groups of respondents.

<p>Effectiveness of Measures: Level 2 Received the Second Highest Percentages of “4” and “5” Ratings</p> <p>Percent “4” or “5” on a “1 to 5” Scale in Which “5” Means “Very Effective”</p>				
Measure	Type of Respondent			
	Law	Corr/Pro	Courts	Treat/Ed
<i>Sample Size =</i>	50	60	61	69
Ignition Interlock Device	44%	58%	30%	58%
Victim Impact Panels	30%	43%	36%	62%
Education to develop employable skills or get a GED	42%	53%	38%	46%
Long-term jail or prison sentences	48%	57%	43%	38%
Incarceration facilities dedicated to housing repeat drunk drivers	40%	52%	36%	46%
Education on family dynamics and resisting peer pressure	44%	47%	28%	51%
Absolute sobriety (zero alcohol limit) after second conviction	50%	40%	28%	48%
Source: Data Table 57				

Main Findings

Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 3

While each of the following measures received high ratings from about one-third to one-half of each group of respondents, there were two notable exceptions. Over half of the Corrections/Probation and Parole respondents gave high ratings to immobilizing the drunk driver's vehicle (55%) and seizing or confiscating the drunk driver's vehicle (52%).

Court System respondents tended to give fewer high ratings, with only 8% giving high ratings to a measure that would punish a person who lent a vehicle to a convicted repeat drunk driver without a valid driver's license.

Effectiveness of Measures: Level 3 Received the Third Highest Percentages of "4" and "5" Ratings Percent "4" or "5" on a "1 to 5" Scale in Which "5" Means "Very Effective"				
Measure	Type of Respondent			
	Law	Corr/Pro	Courts	Treat/Ed
<i>Sample Size =</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>69</i>
Work release under the Huber program	28%	38%	43%	42%
Immobilizing or disabling the drunk driver's vehicle	42%	55%	13%	44%
Seizing or confiscating the drunk driver's vehicle	44%	52%	12%	42%
Jail time on the first conviction	38%	32%	33%	43%
Lower alcohol limit after the first conviction	46%	35%	21%	36%
Electronic monitoring, or EMS	32%	32%	20%	45%
Short-term jail sentences	30%	22%	31%	35%
Fine or license suspension for someone who loans their vehicle to a convicted repeat drunk driver who doesn't have a valid driver's license	36%	37%	8%	36%
Source: Data Table 57				

Main Findings

Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 4

Approximately one-fourth to one-third of each type of respondent gave high ratings to each of the following measures. The largest exception was that 40% of Law Enforcement respondents gave high ratings to special license plates, sometimes called Zebra plates.

Very few Court System respondents gave high ratings to longer waiting times for occupational licenses after the second and subsequent convictions (5%) and higher fines for repeat convictions (2%).

Effectiveness of Measures: Level 4 Received the Fourth Highest Percentages of “4” and “5” Ratings Percent “4” or “5” on a “1 to 5” Scale in Which “5” Means “Very Effective”				
Measure	Type of Respondent			
	Law	Corr/Pro	Courts	Treat/Ed
<i>Sample Size =</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>69</i>
Suspending or revoking the driver’s license	32%	28%	15%	30%
Community service	26%	28%	23%	28%
Longer waiting times for occupational licenses after second or subsequent conviction	26%	37%	5%	38%
Higher fines for repeat convictions	34%	35%	2%	29%
Special license plates, sometimes called Zebra plates	40%	28%	10%	20%
Source: Data Table 57				

Main Findings

Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 5

The last two measures received only a few high ratings. However, over one-third (36%) of Treatment/Education respondents gave high ratings to administrative license suspensions. Very few respondents of any type gave high ratings to public humiliation.

Effectiveness of Measures: Level 5 Received the Fewest “4” and “5” Ratings Percent “4” or “5” on a “1 to 5” Scale in Which “5” Means “Very Effective”				
Measure	Type of Respondent			
	Law	Corr/Pro	Courts	Treat/Ed
<i>Sample Size =</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>69</i>
Administrative license suspension	20%	15%	3%	36%
Public humiliation, such as printing the drunk driver’s name in the newspaper	22%	18%	12%	16%
Source: Data Table 57				

Main Findings

Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: By Respondent Type

In the preceding pages, we explored the opinions of the four types of respondents, with the presentation organized by the overall results. In the following table, we will examine the same data organized by type of respondent. We will see the highly rated measures for each type of respondent—i.e. all measures that received high ratings from at least 50% of each type of respondent.

The first table shows the most highest-rated measures for Law Enforcement and Corrections/Probation and Parole respondents. We see that both groups of respondents gave the most high ratings to:

- “Intensive supervision begun as soon as possible after the arrest”
- “Treatment, such as drug or alcohol treatment”

Respondents from Corrections/Probation and Parole tended to give high ratings to more measures, with Ignition Interlock Devices receiving as many high ratings as drug and alcohol treatment.

Most Effective Measures	
Percent “4” or “5” on a “1 to 5” Scale in Which “5” Means “Very Effective” Law Enforcement and Corrections/ Probation and Parole	
Law Enforcement	Percent
Intensive supervision begun as soon as possible after the arrest	62%
Treatment, such as drug or alcohol treatment	54%
Absolute sobriety (zero alcohol limit) after second conviction	50%
Corrections/Probation and Parole	Percent
Intensive supervision begun as soon as possible after the arrest	63%
Treatment, such as drug or alcohol treatment	58%
Ignition Interlock Device	58%
Long-term jail or prison sentences	57%
Immobilizing or disabling the drunk driver’s vehicle	55%
Education to develop employable skills or get a GED	53%
Incarceration facilities dedicated to housing repeat drunk drivers	52%
Seizing or confiscating the offenders’ vehicle	52%
Source: Data Table 57	

Main Findings

Effectiveness of Measures in Reducing Repeat Drunk Driving: By Respondent Type

Both the Court System and Treatment/Education respondents gave the most high ratings to the same two measures that the Law Enforcement and Corrections/Probation and Patrol respondents did, although in reversed order. Those two measures were:

- “Treatment, such as drug or alcohol treatment”
- “Intensive supervision begun as soon as possible after the arrest”

In addition, 61% of the Court System respondents gave high ratings to probation after conviction and 62% of the Treatment/Education respondents gave high ratings to Victim Impact Panels.

Effectiveness of Measures	
Percent “4” or “5” on a “1 to 5” Scale in Which “5” Means “Very Effective” The Court System and Treatment/Education	
Court System	Percent
Treatment, such as drug or alcohol treatment	77%
Intensive supervision begun as soon as possible after the arrest	66%
Probation after conviction	61%
Education or alcoholism or alcohol abuse	51%
Treatment/Education, etc.	Percent
Treatment, such as drug or alcohol treatment	77%
Intensive supervision begun as soon as possible after the arrest	75%
Victim Impact Panels	62%
Ignition Interlock Device	58%
Probation after conviction	52%
Education on alcoholism or alcohol abuse	52%
Education of family dynamics and resisting peer pressure	51%
Source: Data Table 57	

Main Findings

Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving

In addition to evaluating the effectiveness of 26 measures designed to reduce drunk driving, respondents were asked to agree or disagree with 21 statements about drunk driving. Some of these statements concerned specific measures designed to reduce repeat drunk driving, and some were more general in nature.

The following tables show the percentage of respondents who agreed with each statement. The display of the data will be similar to the display of the data about effectiveness of the various measures. That is, the tables will be organized according to the levels of overall agreement with the statements. The 21 measures will be broken into three categories:

Level 1: The six statements to which the largest percentage of respondents agreed

Level 2: The nine statements to which the second-largest percentage of respondents agreed

Level 3: The six statements to which the fewest respondents agreed

In the tables, some percents are **bolded** to indicate that they are statistically significantly higher (at the 95% level of confidence) than one or more other percents.

Main Findings

Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 1

There were extremely high levels of agreement with six statements—at least 78% of the respondents in each group agreed with each one. The statement that had the highest levels of agreement was, “The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to rehabilitate the drivers so they do not drive drunk again.”

Two of the other statements concerned the importance of treatment, and two concerned the importance of jail. The last said that offenders should be required to attend a Victim Impact Panel if one is available.

Agreement with Statements: Level 1 Largest Percentage of Respondents Agreed Percent Agree				
Statement	Type of Respondent			
	Law	Corr/Pro	Courts	Treat/Ed
<i>Sample Size =</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>69</i>
The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to rehabilitate the drivers so they do not drive drunk again.	88%	85%	92%	91%
Repeat drunk drivers will probably keep driving drunk unless they have some treatment.	92%	83%	87%	91%
All offenders with two or more drunk driving arrests should be required to go through treatment.	94%	88%	89%	83%
Jail time should always be an option for sentencing repeat drunk drivers.	78%	85%	95%	86%
All second-time offenders should be subject to at least one day of jail.	78%	87%	84%	93%
All repeat drunken drivers should be required to attend a Victim Impact Panel if one is available.	84%	78%	79%	90%
Source: Data Table 79				

Main Findings

Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 2

There were varied levels of agreement with these nine statements among the four respondent categories—from 92% to 21% depending on the statement. In this second tier of statements, the two with the highest levels of agreement were: 92% of Law Enforcement respondents agreed that “The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to get them off the roads,” and 83% of Treatment/Education respondents agreed that “Society, as a whole, is not aware enough of the penalties and punishments for repeat drunk driving.”

The statement with the greatest variation in agreement levels was “Wisconsin needs to get tougher on repeat drunk driving.” Over three-fourths (78%) of Law Enforcement respondents agreed with this statement, compared to only 21% of Court System respondents.

Agreement with Statements: Level 2 Second Largest Percentage of Respondents Agreed Percent Agree				
Statement	Type of Respondent			
	Law	Corr/Pro	Courts	Treat/Ed
<i>Sample Size =</i>	50	60	61	69
The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to get them off the roads.	92%	77%	59%	65%
Society, as a whole, is not aware enough of the penalties and punishments for repeat drunk driving.	56%	68%	66%	83%
Judges should have more discretion in sentencing drunk drivers.	54%	58%	75%	52%
Wisconsin needs to get tougher on repeat drunk driving.	78%	73%	21%	67%
Society, as a whole, does not take the issue of drunk driving seriously enough.	68%	55%	36%	74%
Probation should be required for second-time offenders.	60%	42%	49%	58%
All first-time offenders should be subject to at least one day of jail.	44%	67%	38%	55%
Judges often do not have enough information to effectively sentence repeat drunk drivers.	36%	43%	57%	65%
Alcoholics Anonymous is effective for the repeat drunk drivers who participate in its program.	50%*	40%*	49%*	59%*
Source: Data Table 79				
*Lack of familiarity with Alcoholics Anonymous appears to have affected the agreement level for the AA statement. Overall, very few respondents disagreed that Alcoholics Anonymous is effective, but a large percent (24%) said they neither agreed nor disagreed, and 13% said they did not know or did not have opinions.				

Main Findings

Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving: Level 3

There were low levels of agreement with six statements—for almost all of these statements, fewer than 50% of each type of respondent agreed. However, there were two exceptions: 56% of Law Enforcement agreed that “Long-term jail or prison sentences are effective in reducing repeat drunk driving,” and 59% of Court System respondents agreed that “OWI fines should be on a sliding scale, based on the offender’s ability to pay.”

The statement with the lowest level of agreement was “Imposing large fines of several thousand dollars is an effective way to reduce repeat drunk driving.” Only 2% of Court System respondents agreed with this statement.

Agreement with Statements: Level 3 Fewest Respondents Agreed Percent Agree				
Statement	Type of Respondent			
	Law	Corr/Pro	Courts	Treat/Ed
<i>Sample Size =</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>61</i>	<i>69</i>
Long-term jail or prison sentences are effective in reducing repeat drunk driving.	56%	43%	43%	22%
OWI fines should be on a sliding scale, based on the offender’s ability to pay.	26%	32%	59%	30%
Repeat drunken driving is usually a symptom of other mental health problems.	28%	30%	39%	36%
Wisconsin should get rid of occupational driver’s licenses for convicted repeat drunk drivers.	42%	42%	15%	23%
The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to punish the offender.	30%	33%	20%	19%
Imposing large fines of several thousand dollars is an effective way to reduce repeat drunk driving.	28%	13%	2%	22%
Source: Data Table 79				

Main Findings

Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving: By Respondent Type

In the preceding pages, we explored the agreement levels of the four types of respondents, with the presentation organized by the overall results. In the following table, we will examine the same data organized by type of respondent. We will see the statements that received agreement from at least 75% of each type of respondent. The first table shows the statements with the highest levels of agreement by Law Enforcement and Corrections/Probation and Patrol respondents.

The one statement that has the highest levels of agreement from both sets of respondents is “All offenders with two or more drunk driving arrests should be required to go through treatment.”

Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving	
Law Enforcement	Percent
All offenders with two or more drunk driving arrests should be required to go through treatment	94%
Repeat drunk drivers will probably keep driving drunk unless they have some treatment	92%
The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to get them off the roads	92%
The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to rehabilitate the drivers so they do not drive drunk again	88%
All repeat drunk drivers should be required to attend a Victim Impact Panel if one is available	84%
Jail time should always be an option for sentencing repeat drunk drivers	78%
All second-time offenders should be subject to at least one day in jail	78%
Wisconsin needs to get tougher on repeat drunk driving	78%
Corrections/Probation and Parole	Percent
All offenders with two or more drunk driving arrests should be required to go through treatment	88%
All second-time offenders should be subject to at least one day in jail	87%
The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to rehabilitate the drivers so they do not drive drunk again	85%
Jail time should always be an option for sentencing repeat drunk drivers	85%
Repeat drunk drivers will probably keep driving drunk unless they have some treatment	83%
All repeat drunk drivers should be required to attend a Victim Impact Panel if one is available	78%
The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to get them off the roads	77%
Source: Data Table 79	

Main Findings

Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving: By Respondent Type

Both the Court System and Treatment/Education respondents had the highest agreement levels to the statements about the necessity of jail time; 95% of the Court System respondents agreed that “Jail time should always be an option for sentencing repeat drunk drivers.” In addition, 93% of Treatment/Education respondents agreed that “All second-time offenders should be subject to at least one day in jail.”

The other statements with high levels of agreement tended to stress treatment and Victim Impact Panels.

Agreement with Statements About Repeat Drunk Driving	
Court System	Percent
Jail time should always be an option for sentencing repeat drunk drivers	95%
The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to rehabilitate the drivers so they do not drive drunk again	92%
All offenders with two or more drunk driving arrests should be required to go through treatment	89%
Repeat drunk drivers will probably keep driving drunk unless they have some treatment	87%
All second-time offenders should be subject to at least one day in jail	84%
All repeat drunk drivers should be required to attend a Victim Impact Panel if one is available	79%
Judges should have more discretion in sentencing drunk drivers	75%
Treatment/Education, etc.	Percent
All second-time offenders should be subject to at least one day in jail	93%
The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to rehabilitate the drivers so they do not drive drunk again	91%
Repeat drunk drivers will probably keep driving drunk unless they have some treatment	91%
All repeat drunk drivers should be required to attend a Victim Impact Panel if one is available	90%
Jail time should always be an option for sentencing repeat drunk drivers	86%
All offenders with two or more drunk driving arrests should be required to go through treatment	83%
Society, as a whole, is not aware enough of the penalties and punishments for repeat drunk driving	83%
Source: Data Table 79	

Main Findings

The Main Goal of Dealing with Drunk Drivers: By Respondent Type

The following table shows how each type of respondent—and members of each functional area within each type—answered the questions about “the main goal” of dealing with drunk drivers. It shows the percentages of respondents who agreed with each of the three statements. (The reader should keep in mind that a respondent was not asked to rank the three goals; a respondent could agree or disagree with any, all, or none of the goals.)

The table shows that for each of the four main respondent types—and for almost all of the sub-groups—the largest percentage of respondents agreed with the goal of rehabilitation of the drunk drivers and the lowest percentage agreed with the goal of punishment. The only exception was an identical percentage of Prosecution respondents agreed on the rehabilitation and the “get the offenders off the roads” goal.

The Main Goal of Dealing With Drunk Drivers Should be to...				
Respondent Type Respondent Functional Area	Sample Size =	Main Goal		
		Reha- bilitate Drivers	Get Offenders Off Roads	Punish Offenders
Law Enforcement	50	88%	92%	30%
Corrections and Probation & Parole	60	85%	77%	33%
Corrections	25	80%	92%	48%
Probation & Parole	35	89%	66%	23%
Court System	61	92%	59%	20%
Defense	20	100%	35%	5%
Prosecution	22	82%	82%	36%
Judicial (Judge/Staff)	19	95%	58%	16%
Government/Soc Ser/Education/Treatment	69	91%	65%	19%
Government/Public Health/Social Services	35	91%	63%	14%
Treatment/Counseling/Education	34	91%	68%	24%
Source: Data Table 79				

Main Findings

The Main Goal of Dealing with Drunk Drivers: By Demographic Group

The following table shows the percent of each demographic group who agreed with each goal. Regardless of county type, gender, and years of experience, most respondents said the main goal of deal with drunk drivers should be rehabilitation. The data show that for each demographic group, the largest percentage agreed with the goal of rehabilitation, the second-largest group agreed with the goal of getting the offenders off the roads, and the smallest percentage agreed with the goal of punishment.

The Main Goal of Dealing With Drunk Drivers Should be to...				
Respondent Demographic Group	Sample Size =	Main Goal		
		Reha- bilitate Drivers	Get Offenders Off Roads	Punish Offenders
TOTAL SAMPLE	250	89%	72%	24%
Type of County				
Urban	41	88%	71%	24%
Middle	57	90%	63%	18%
Rural	155	89%	76%	27%
Gender				
Male	169	88%	75%	24%
Female	81	90%	68%	25%
Years of Experience				
10 or less	88	89%	67%	28%
11 – 20	82	89%	70%	20%
21 or more	80	89%	81%	25%
Note: Because the data in this table are not limited to the four employment categories, answers of all 250 survey respondents are shown. The number of respondents in the three types of counties is greater than 250 because some respondents worked in multiple counties.				
Source: Data Table 79				

APPENDIX

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE



Appendix – Survey Questionnaire

DISPOSITION _____ CODE _____ 4136_

010041361

08/08/01 – 7

ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION

REPEAT DRUNK DRIVING

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

First Call: Date _____ Time _____ Interviewer _____

1st Callback _____

2nd Callback _____

3rd Callback _____

Name _____ Title _____

Company _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

Telephone A/C _____ Number _____

INTERVIEWER: ASK TO SPEAK TO NAME ON LIST. IF THIS PERSON IS NOT AVAILABLE, ASK WHEN WOULD BE A GOOD TIME TO CALL BACK.

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is _____ from The Dieringer Research Group, an independent marketing research company. We are a professional research organization that surveys the attitudes and opinions of professionals on various topics.

We have been contracted by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation to assist in the study and evaluation of various alternatives to incarceration for repeat drunk drivers. This study, a joint effort between the Departments of Corrections, Health and Family Services, and Transportation, is required by the 1999 Wisconsin Act 109, Section 88.

Your name has been provided as a candidate for this study from the [INSERT FUNCTIONAL AREA FROM LIST] functional area.



Appendix – Survey Questionnaire

1. Does this general functional area best describe your area of responsibility?

_____ Yes (**SKIP TO #2.**)

_____ No (**PROCEED TO #1.1.**)

1.1. Which of the following functional areas best describe it? (**READ LIST.**)

<u>Functional Area</u>	
_____ Law Enforcement	(CHECK Q UOTA)
_____ Court System -Defense	(CHECK Q UOTA)
_____ Court System -Prosecution	(CHECK Q UOTA)
_____ Court System -Judicial (Judge/Staff)	(CHECK Q UOTA)
_____ Government/Public Health	(CHECK Q UOTA)
_____ Social Services	(CHECK Q UOTA)
_____ Corrections	(CHECK Q UOTA)
_____ Education	(CHECK Q UOTA)
_____ Treatment/Counseling Programs	(CHECK Q UOTA)
_____ Probation/Parole Agents	(CHECK Q UOTA)
_____ Other (Specify)_____	
_____ Don't know / Refused	(THANK AND TERMINATE)

2. Are you knowledgeable about repeat drunk driving?

_____ Yes (**PROCEED TO #3.**)

_____ No (**ASK TO SPEAK TO SOMEONE WHO IS.**)

_____ Don't Know/Refused (**ASK TO SPEAK TO SOMEONE WHO IS.**)

3. How many years have you been involved in the [INSERT FUNCTIONAL AREA] functional area?

_____ years
Less than one year.....98
Don't know99

4. Do you work in Wisconsin?

_____ Yes (**PROCEED TO #5.**)

_____ No (**THANK AND TERMINATE.**)

_____ Don't Know (**THANK AND TERMINATE.**)

Appendix – Survey Questionnaire

5. In which county do you work?

Adams	1	Iron	26	Price	51
Ashland	2	Jackson	27	Racine	52
Barron.....	3	Jefferson.....	28	Richland.....	53
Bayfield.....	4	Juneau.....	29	Rock.....	54
Brown.....	5	Kenosha	30	Rusk	55
Buffalo	6	Kewaunee.....	31	St. Croix.....	56
Burnett.....	7	La Crosse	32	Sauk	57
Calumet.....	8	Lafayette	33	Sawyer	58
Chippewa	9	Langlade.....	34	Shawano.....	59
Clark.....	10	Lincoln.....	35	Sheboygan.....	60
Columbia	11	Manitowoc.....	36	Taylor.....	61
Crawford	12	Marathon.....	37	Trempealeau.....	62
Dane	13	Marinette.....	38	Vernon.....	63
Dodge	14	Marquette.....	39	Vilas.....	64
Door	15	Menominee	40	Walworth.....	65
Douglas	16	Milwaukee	41	Washburn.....	66
Dunn.....	17	Monroe	42	Washington.....	67
Eau Claire.....	18	Oconto	43	Waukesha.....	68
Florence.....	19	Oneida.....	44	Waupaca	69
Fond du Lac	20	Outagamie.....	45	Waushara	70
Forest.....	21	Ozaukee	46	Winnebago	71
Grant.....	22	Pepin.....	47	Wood	72
Green.....	23	Pierce	48		
Green Lake.....	24	Polk	49	Other, Specify	
Iowa.....	25	Portage	50	DK/Refused	99

Appendix – Survey Questionnaire

QUESTIONS:

6. First I would like to name some measures that are currently in use or that have been suggested as ways to reduce repeat drunk driving. For each one I name, please tell me how effective you think it is in reducing repeat drunk driving. Please use a scale of 1 to 5 scale in which “5” means you think it is very effective in reducing repeat drunk driving, and “1” means you do not think it is effective at all. You may use any number from 1 to 5.

As you rate these measures, keep in mind that no ONE measure is very effective all by itself. So answer how effective each measure is AS PART OF A COMBINED EFFORT to fight repeat drunk driving.. **(READ LIST. RANDOMIZE ORDER.)**

	Very Effective				Not at all Effective	DK
Short-term jail sentences.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Long-term jail or prison sentences.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Treatment, such as drug or alcohol treatment.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Education on alcoholism or alcohol abuse.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Education on family dynamics and resisting peer pressure	5	4	3	2	1	6
Education to develop employable skills or get a GED.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Electronic monitoring, or EMS.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Suspending or revoking the driver’s license.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Victim Impact Panels.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Seizing or confiscating the drunk driver’s vehicle.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Ignition Interlock Device	5	4	3	2	1	6
Community service	5	4	3	2	1	6
Work release under the Huber program.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Immobilizing or disabling the drunk driver’s vehicle.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Administrative license suspension.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Public humiliation, such as printing the drunk driver’s name in the newspaper	5	4	3	2	1	6
Special license plates, sometimes called Zebra plates.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Probation after conviction.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Intensive supervision begun as soon as possible after the arrest.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Incarceration facilities dedicated to housing repeat drunk drivers	5	4	3	2	1	6
Jail time on the first conviction.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Lower alcohol limit after the first conviction.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Absolute sobriety (zero alcohol limit) after second conviction.....	5	4	3	2	1	6
Higher fines for repeat convictions	5	4	3	2	1	6
Fine or license suspension for someone who loans their vehicle to a convicted repeat drunk driver who doesn’t have a valid driver’s license ..	5	4	3	2	1	6
Longer waiting times for occupational licenses after second or subsequent conviction.....	5	4	3	2	1	6

Appendix – Survey Questionnaire

Agree/Disagree Statements:

7. Now I would like to read several statements. For each one, please tell me if you agree, disagree, or neither agree nor disagree with it. If you don't know or don't have an opinion, that is okay too. Just let me know. **(RANDOMIZE THE ORDER OF STATEMENTS.):**

Agree with it.....3
Neither agree nor disagree2
Disagree1
Don't know/No opinion.....4

1. All first-time offenders should be subject to at least one day of jail.
2. All second-time offenders should be subject to at least one day of jail.
3. All offenders with two or more drunk driving arrests should be required to go through treatment.
4. Wisconsin should get rid of occupational driver's licenses for convicted repeat drunk drivers.
5. Wisconsin needs to get tougher on repeat drunk driving.
6. Imposing large fines of several thousand dollars is an effective way to reduce repeat drunk driving.
7. Probation should be required for second-time offenders.
8. Judges should have more discretion in sentencing drunk drivers.
9. Jail time should always be an option for sentencing repeat drunk drivers.
10. The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to rehabilitate the drivers so they do not drive drunk again.
11. The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to get them off the roads.
12. Repeat drunk drivers will probably keep driving drunk unless they have some treatment.
13. Repeat drunken driving is usually a symptom of other mental health problems.
14. OWI fines should be on a sliding scale, based on the offender's ability to pay.
15. All repeat drunken drivers should be required to attend a Victim Impact Panel if one is available.
16. Long-term jail or prison sentences are effective in reducing repeat drunk driving.
17. Alcoholics Anonymous is effective for the repeat drunk drivers who participate in its program.
18. Judges often do not have enough information to effectively sentence repeat drunk drivers.
19. Society, as a whole, is not aware enough of the penalties and punishments for repeat drunk driving.
20. Society, as a whole, does not take the issue of drunk driving seriously enough.
21. The main goal of dealing with drunk drivers should be to punish the offender.

8. **RECORD GENDER. DO NOT ASK.**

Male1
Female2

Appendix – Survey Questionnaire

9. For verification purposes, may I have your full name?

10. May I have your title?

11. May I have your organization?

CLOSING:

Those are all the questions I have for you today. Thank you for your help on this project.